

From: [John Laplante](#)
To: [Miller, Garyg](#)
Cc: [David Keith](#)
Subject: RE: Alternatives for SanJacinto (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2015 5:00:45 PM
Attachments: [SJRWP FS Residual Release Assumptions 04-22-15.pdf](#)

Hi Gary –

On behalf of David Keith, please find attached a summary of our modeling assumptions per the email request below for the SJRWP FS. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thanks.

John Laplante, P.E.

[Anchor QEA, L.L.C](#)

720 Olive Way Suite 1900
Seattle, WA 98101

direct: 206.903.3323
mobile: 206.795.2676
fax: 206.287.9131

This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130.

From: Miller, Garyg [<mailto:Miller.Garyg@epa.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 11:14 AM
To: David Keith
Cc: Hayter, Earl J ERDC-CHL-MS; Hayter, Earl J ERDC-RDE-EL-MS; Rogers, Natalie S ERD-MS; Paul R Schroeder (Paul.R.Schroeder@erdcdren.mil)
Subject: RE: Alternatives for SanJacinto (UNCLASSIFIED)

David,

Please see the email below; can you either confirm or provide revisions as needed?

Thanks,

Gary Miller
EPA Remedial Project Manager
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

From: Schroeder, Paul R ERDC-RDE-EL-MS [<mailto:Paul.R.Schroeder@erdcdren.mil>]
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 12:03 PM
To: Miller, Garyg



9671992

Cc: Hayter, Earl J ERDC-CHL-MS; Hayter, Earl J ERDC-RDE-EL-MS; Rogers, Natalie S ERD-MS

Subject: Alternatives for SanJacinto (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: FOUO

Gary,

We are having considerable difficulties in identifying the details (and corresponding fate and transport modeling assumptions) of the San Jacinto FS alternatives.

The fate and transport modeling results suggests inconsistency in the BMPs between the alternatives. It would be helpful if there were a simple table of contaminant release assumptions by areas.

For example:

Alternative 4N:

Within Western Cell Footprint: sheet pile wall BMP,
performed in the dry;
no releases except dust, collected water
after cap removal will be treated before discharge;
very little residuals, capped with
geomembrane/geotextiles and armor material

Within Eastern Cell Footprint: sheet pile wall BMP,
performed in the dry where water depths are less
than about 3 feet;
no releases except dust, collected water
after cap removal will be treated before discharge;
very little residuals, capped with geotextile
and armor material
performed in the wet where water depths are
greater than about 3 feet (northwestern portion);
0.85% losses
very little residuals, capped with geotextile
and armor material

Alternative 5N:

Within Western Cell Footprint: sheet pile wall BMP,
performed in the dry;
no releases except dust, collected water
after cap removal will be treated before discharge;
very little residuals, capped with 2 ft of
backfill (no mixing with residuals), geotextiles and
armor material

Within Eastern Cell Footprint: sheet pile wall BMP,
performed in the dry where water depths are less
than about 3 feet;
no releases except dust, collected water
after cap removal will be treated before discharge;
very little residuals, capped with 2 ft of
backfill (no mixing with residuals), geotextile and
armor material
performed in the wet where water depths are
greater than about 3 feet (northwestern portion);
0.85% losses
7% residuals, capped with 3 ft of backfill
(bottom 12 inches mixed with 5% residuals),
geotextile and armor material

Alternative 5aN:

Within Western Cell Footprint: sheet pile wall BMP,
performed in the dry;
no releases except dust, collected water
after cap removal will be treated before discharge;
very little residuals, capped with 1 ft of
backfill (no mixing with residuals)

Within Eastern Cell 5N Footprint: sheet pile wall BMP,
performed in the dry where water depths are less
than about 3 feet;
no releases except dust, collected water
after cap removal will be treated before discharge;
very little residuals, capped with 1 ft of
backfill (no mixing with residuals)
performed in the wet where water depths are
greater than about 3 feet (northwestern portion);
0.85% losses
7% residuals, capped with 2 ft of backfill
(bottom 12 inches mixed with 5% residuals)

Within Eastern Cell outside
5N Footprint: silt curtain BMP,
performed in the wet where water depths are
greater than about 3 feet (northwestern portion);
3% losses
5% residuals, capped with 2 ft of backfill
(bottom 12 inches mixed with 5% residuals)

Alternative 6N:

Within Western Cell Footprint: sheet pile wall BMP,
performed in the dry;
no releases except dust, collected water
after cap removal will be treated before discharge;
very little residuals, capped with 1 ft of
backfill (no mixing with residuals)

Within Eastern Cell 5N Footprint: sheet pile wall BMP,
performed in the dry where water depths are less
than about 3 feet;
no releases except dust, collected water
after cap removal will be treated before discharge;
very little residuals, capped with 1 ft of
backfill (no mixing with residuals)
performed in the wet where water depths are
greater than about 3 feet (northwestern portion);
0.85% losses
7% residuals, capped with 2 ft of backfill
(bottom 12 inches mixed with 5% residuals)

Within Eastern Cell outside 5N
and inside 5aN Footprints: silt curtain BMP,
performed in the wet where water depths are
greater than about 3 feet (northwestern portion);
3% losses
5% residuals, capped with 2 ft of backfill
(bottom 12 inches mixed with 5% residuals)

Within Eastern Cell outside 5aN
Footprint: silt curtain BMP,
performed in the wet where water depths are
greater than about 3 feet (northwestern portion);
3% losses
5% residuals, capped with 2 ft of backfill
(bottom 12 inches mixed with 5% residuals)

Would it be possible for the PRPs to supply this table with their assumptions? These would be our assumptions (more or less), but I do not think that they match their alternatives.

Thanks,

Paul

Paul R. Schroeder, PhD, PE
Research Civil Engineer

Environmental Laboratory
3909 Halls Ferry Road
US Army Engineer Research and Development Center
Vicksburg, MS 39180-6199
601 634-3709

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: FOUO